

STATE PLAN FOR AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

I. Summary of State Plan Requirements. Each State agency, in its State Plan, shall describe the activities planned for providing services to the agricultural community, both agricultural employers and Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers (MSFWs). The plan shall contain the following:

A. Assessment of need. (See Part II)

All States shall prepare a comprehensive assessment of need plan in accordance with Federal requirements at 20 CFR Part 653.

B. Outreach Plan. (See Part III)

All States shall prepare a comprehensive outreach plan in accordance with requirements at 20 CFR 653.107.

C. ES Services Provided to MSFWs. (See Part IV)

All States are to plan to meet at least the minimum requirements for providing services to MSFWs. All States are required to meet at least four of the five equity indicators. Significant MSFW States additionally must meet at least four of the seven minimum service level indicators.

States which expect to have difficulty in meeting the MSFW performance indicators shall describe the nature of the problem and the steps planned to meet the performance indicators.

D. ES Services Provided to Agricultural Employers.
(See Part V)

All States are required to describe efforts planned in providing ES services to agricultural employers in both those States with an adequate supply of U.S. workers and those where the supply appears to be inadequate.

E. Other Plan Requirements

1. State Monitor Advocate Approval/Comments.

All States are to provide a statement that the State Monitor Advocate prepared or participated in the preparation of the

agricultural plan and has been afforded the opportunity to approve and/or comment on the agricultural plan.

2. Consideration of Previous Year's Annual Monitor Advocate Report.

All States are to provide a statement indicating that consideration was given to the State Monitor Advocate's recommendations as presented in the annual MSFW summary developed under 20 CFR 653.109(t), in the preparation of this plan.

3. Affirmative Action Plan Review/Comments.

All States are to provide a statement indicating that, as per 20 CFR 653.111(4)(h), the State Monitor Advocate has been afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the State's Affirmative Action Plan, which is to be submitted as part of the State plan.

States with designated Significant Affirmative Action Local Offices are required to submit an Affirmative Action Plan in accordance with 20 CFR 653.111.

4. Review and comment by JTPA, Section 402 grantees.

All States are to provide information indicating that JTPA, Section 402 grantees, other appropriate MSFW groups, public agencies, agricultural employer organizations and other interested employer organizations, have been given the opportunity to comment on the State Agricultural Services Plan, including any required significant MSFW local office affirmative action plans. A list of organizations from whom information and suggestions for the plans were solicited, any comments received on the proposed plans and agency responses are to be submitted with the plan.

II. Assessment of need. This assessment of need shall take into account data supplied by JTPA 402 grantees, MSFW organizations, employer organizations, Federal/State Agencies, Migrant Education agency, etc. This assessment of need shall include:

- A. A review of the previous year's agricultural activity in the State.
 - Identify each major labor intensive crop activity in the previous year, indicating the months of heavy activity and the geographic area of prime activity.
- B. A review of the previous year's MSFW activity in the State.

- Estimate the agricultural labor employed in each of the crops identified in item II.A. Estimate the number of MSFWs involved in each, and indicate crop areas which experienced labor shortages.
- C. A projected level of agricultural activity expected in the State in the coming year.
- Identify any changes from last year's crop activities as described in item II.A
- D. A projected number of MSFWs in the State in the coming year.
- Identify any changes in the numbers of MSFWs involved in each crop activity as described in item II.A.

III. Outreach Plan. Each State shall prepare a comprehensive outreach plan in accordance with Federal requirements at 20 CFR Part 653. The Outreach Plan must be based on the actual conditions which exist in the particular State, taking into account the State Agency's history of providing outreach services, the estimated number of MSFWs in the State, and the need for outreach services in the State.

The five States with the highest estimated year-round MSFW activities must assign full-time year-round staff to outreach activities. These States are designated each year by the Employment and Training Administration. The designations for PY 1998 is provided in Table 5. The remainder of the significant MSFW States must make maximum efforts to hire outreach staff with MSFW experience for year-round positions and shall assign outreach staff to work full-time during the period of highest activity.

Approval by the Regional Administrator will be based on the State adequately addressing the following features of the Outreach Plan:

- A. Assessment of Available Resources. This assessment of the resources available for outreach shall include:
1. The number of State Agency staff positions to be assigned to outreach activities. Indicate the full time equivalent positions for each local office to which staff are to be assigned, and the number of staff assigned to the State office for this purpose.

Designated significant local offices should assign full-time staff for outreach duties during the peak seasons.

2. Where the number of State Agency staff positions assigned to outreach activities is less than in the prior year, please explain the reason for the reduction, and the expected effect of the reduction on direct outreach activities.
3. Resources to be made available through existing cooperative agreements with public and private community service agencies and MSFW groups. (States are encouraged to initiate cooperative agreements with 402 grantees for outreach positions).

B. Numerical Goals. The anticipated results of the outreach efforts to be provided in item A. These goals shall include:

1. The number of MSFWs to be contacted during the program year by ES staff, listed by local office where outreach staff is assigned, as well as State office.
2. The number of staff days (based on 8 hour days) to be utilized for outreach, listed by local office where outreach staff is assigned, as well as the State office.
3. The number of MSFWs planned to be contacted by other agencies under cooperative arrangements.

C. Proposed Outreach Activities. Describe the outreach efforts to be provided by the ES staff indicated in item B. These efforts shall include those described in 20 CFR 653.107(i-p). Also, describe any coordinated plans and activities with other agencies where possible surplus of workers may exist.

IV. ES Services Provided to MSFWs.

A. Plan Data for the Upcoming Year.

If a State's estimated plan data for the current year indicates difficulty in meeting equity indicators, minimum services levels, or planned levels of activity, the following items must be included in a narrative plan:

- a. A description of the problems;
- b. Specific steps planned to meet minimum service levels; and
- c. Specific steps planned to meet equity level of services.

Federal regulations at 20 CFR 653.112 require the establishment of performance indicators reflecting equity and the measurement of minimum levels of service. The indicators established by ETA include five ES-controlled indicators to measure equity of service, and seven minimum service level indicators. All States are required to meet at least four of the five equity indicators. Significant MSFW States additionally are required to meet at least four of the seven minimum service level indicators.

The seven minimum service level indicators are listed on Table 3. These standards are set to encourage appropriate service to MSFWs and to assure the continuation of such services. The minimum service levels are established annually.

The standards are set at a level high enough to encourage low performing States to improve their performance, but not so high as to make achievement extraordinarily difficult.

The five equity indicators for all States are:

- Ratio of non-MSFW to MSFWs referred to jobs.
- Ratio of non-MSFW to MSFWs for whom service is provided.
- Ratio of non-MSFWs to MSFWs referred to supportive services.
- Ratio of non-MSFWs to MSFWs counseled.
- Ratio of non-MSFWs to MSFWs for whom a job development contact was made.

B. Significant MSFW Local Office Affirmative Action Plans.

Significant MSFW local offices which are required to develop and submit an Affirmative Action Plan were designated in accordance with 20 CFR 653.111. The designations for PY 1998 of Affirmative Plan offices is provided in Table 2.

The Affirmative Action Plan must include a comparison of the racial and ethnic composition of the workforce and that of the local office staff. When the comparison shows an under-representation of a racial or ethnic group in the local office, the plan must establish a reasonable timetable with goals to remedy the imbalance.

V. ES Services Provided to Agricultural Employers.

A. Data Analysis

1. Previous year's history (based on PY 97 actual data):

- a. Number of agricultural job orders and openings received
- b. Number of agricultural job orders filled
- c. Per cent filled $[(b/a) \times 100]$
- d. Number of interstate clearance orders received
- e. Number of interstate clearance orders initiated

2. Plan for upcoming year (based on estimated data).

- a. Number of agricultural job orders expected to be received
- b. Number of agricultural job orders projected to be filled
- c. Per cent to be filled $[(b/a) \times 100]$
- d. Estimated number of interstate clearance orders State will receive
- e. Estimated number of interstate clearance orders the State will initiate

B. Narrative Description

All States shall provide a description of their efforts in providing ES services to agricultural employers, including both those with an adequate supply of U.S. workers and those where the supply may be inadequate. These efforts should include:

- A description on how the State agency plans to provide ES services to agricultural employers.
- A description of the process used to identify agricultural employers expected to utilize MSFWs.
- A description of the process for linking available workers with the employers, including the cooperation with or the creation of coordinating bodies to assure programs are coordinated and to insure programs respond to local needs. These coordinating groups may consist of organizations such as the Employment Service, 402 grantees, agricultural employers, migrant education groups, migrant health groups, etc.
- Describe the process on how the State will promote ES services available to agricultural employers, e.g., participation in employer conferences, development of

marketing tools, labor exchange information to employers, recruitment of U.S. workers, etc.

- Where an H-2A program operated in the State in previous year, explain efforts to increase U.S. worker participation.

VI. Enclosures to State Plan for Agricultural Services:

Table 1. Significant MSFW States

Table 2. Significant MSFW Local Offices Affirmative Action Plan

Table 3. Minimum Service Level Indicators

Table 4. Significant Local offices and Bilingual Offices, by Region

Table 5. States with the Highest Estimated Year-Round Activities

Table 1

SIGNIFICANT STATES FOR PY 1998

| Total U.S MSFW Applications | | 191,959 |
|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| | <u>States</u> | <u>MSFW Applications</u> |
| 1. | Arizona | 9,688 |
| 2. | California | 34,702 |
| 3. | Colorado | 693 |
| 4. | Florida | 20,705 |
| 5. | Georgia | 8,330 |
| 6. | Idaho | 2,029 |
| 7. | Michigan | 9,902 |
| 8. | Minnesota | 3,308 |
| 9. | New Mexico | 2,254 |
| 10. | New York | 2,467 |
| 11. | North Carolina | 15,073 |
| 12. | North Dakota | 646 |
| 13. | Ohio | 2,196 |
| 14. | Oregon | 5,207 |
| 15. | Puerto Rico | 8,886 |
| 16. | South Carolina | 3,605 |
| 17. | Texas | 31,283 |
| 18. | Virginia | 4,256 |
| 19. | Washington | 16,483 |
| 20. | Wisconsin | 1,086 |

Table 2

SIGNIFICANT MSFW LOCAL OFFICES -- AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN FOR 1998

| <u>MSFW Significant Offices</u> | <u>Region</u> | <u>MSFW Applications</u> | <u>Cumulative MSFW Applications</u> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|---|
| 1. Exmore, VA | VII | 3,656 | |
| 2. McAllen, TX | VI | 4,354 | 8,010 |
| 3. Eagle Pass, TX | VI | 3,296 | 11,306 |
| 4. Weslaco, TX | VI | 4,935 | 16,241 |
| 5. Edinburgh, TX | VI | 5,235 | 21,476 |
| 6. Sunnyside, WA | X | 3,000 | 24,476 |

Total MSFW Applications: $191,959 \times 20\% = 38,391$

Federal regulations @ 20 CFR 653.111(b)(1) require that "Affirmative Action Plan" local offices be designated each year. The local offices listed above represented the top 20% of MSFW activity nationally.

Table 3

MINIMUM SERVICE LEVEL INDICATORS, PY 1998
Percentage of MSFW's

| Significant MSFWs States (PY 1997) | (1) # MSFWs Placed | (2) Placed \$.50 Above Hourly Wage | (3) Placed on Long-Term Non-AG. Jobs |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Arizona | 42.5% | 14.0% | 3.8% |
| California | 42.5 | 14.0 | 4.9 |
| Colorado | 42.5 | 14.0 | 5.9 |
| Florida | 42.5 | 14.0 | 6.0 |
| Georgia | 42.5 | 9.0 | 3.0 |
| Idaho | 42.5 | 14.0 | 7.3 |
| Michigan | 42.5 | 14.0 | 3.8 |
| Minnesota | 42.5 | 14.0 | 4.3 |
| New Mexico | 42.5 | 14.0 | 3.0 |
| New York | 42.5 | 14.0 | 6.5 |
| North Carolina | 42.5 | 14.0 | 5.0 |
| North Dakota | 42.5 | 14.0 | 4.5 |
| Ohio | 42.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Oregon | 42.5 | 14.0 | 6.2 |
| Puerto Rico | 42.5 | 12.0 | 4.2 |
| South Carolina | 42.5 | 14.0 | 3.9 |
| Texas | 42.5 | 14.0 | 8.2 |
| Virginia | 42.5 | 14.0 | 5.2 |
| Washington | 42.5 | 14.0 | 3.3 |
| Wisconsin | 42.5 | 14.0 | 3.5 |

Acceptable minimum performance levels for the remaining four indicators are as follows:

(4) Local Office Reviews: One hundred percent of significant MSFW local offices shall be reviewed by State or Federal staff.

(5) Field Checks: Commencing with PY 96, minimum performance levels were established by the States per 20 CFR 653.112(c).

(6) Outreach Staff Contacts: Commencing with PY 96, minimum performance levels were established by the States per 20 CFR 653.112(c).

(7) Complaint Resolution: Commencing with PY 95, minimum performance levels shall as established by the State per 20 CFR 653.112(c).

Table 4

SIGNIFICANT LOCAL OFFICES AND BILINGUAL OFFICES , PY 1998

REGION II

New Jersey
Hammonton
Vineline/Bridgeton

New York
Albion
Batavia/Elba
Hudson
Kingston
Lockport
Middleton/Pine Island*
Newark
Riverhead

Puerto Rico
Aguadilla
Arecibo/Manati
Caguás/Cayey*
Guayama*
Humacao/Fajardo
Mayaguez/SanGerman*
Ponce/Coamo*
Bayamon

REGION III

Delaware
Dover*

Maryland
Crisfield*

Virginia
Exmore*
Winchester

West Virginia

Martinsburg

REGION IV

Florida
Apopka*
Belle Glade*
Bradenton*
Fort Pierce*
Homestead*
Immokalee*
Naples*
Plant City*
Quincy*
Sebring*
Wauchula*
Winter Haven*

Georgia
Americus*
Bainbridge*
Cordele*
Douglas*
Moultrie/Camille*
Vidalia*
Statesboro*

North Carolina
Clinton
Dunn*
Elizabethtown
Greenville
Hendersonville*
Kenansville*
Mt. Olive
Washington
Wilson*
Smithfield*

New Bern

South Carolina
Aiken*
Beaufort*
Charleston*

South Carolina (Cont'd)
Spartanburg*
Sumter*

REGION V

Illinois
Danville*
Kankakee*
Murhypsboro/Cobden*
Peoria*

Michigan
Freemont
Hartford*
Mainstee
South Haven
Sparta*
Traverse City*

Minnesota

Crookston*
East Grand Forks*
Fergus Falls*
Moorhead*
Owatonna*
Willmar*

Wisconsin
Beaver Dam*
Wautoma*

REGION VI

New Mexico

Deming*

Las Cruces*

Texas

Brownsville*

Canutillo

Texas (Cont'd)

Carrizo Springs

Crystal City*

Del Rio*

Eagle Pass*

Edinburgh*

Fabens

Floydada**

Harligen

Hereford

Laredo

Lamesa

McAllen*

Muleshoe**

Pecos

Plainviews*

Raymondville*

Uvalde*

Weslaco*

REGION VII

None

REGION VIII

Colorado

Brighton*

Delta*

Greeley*

Montana

Sidney*

REGION IX

Arizona

Coolidge*

Douglas*

Wilcox*

Yuma*

Maryvale

California

Bakersfield

Blythe*

California (Cont'd)

Chico

Colusa*

Delano*

El Centro*

Fresno (West)*

Gilroy

Hanford*

Hollister*

Huron*

Indio*

Lakeport*

Lamont*

Los Banos*

Madera*

Manteca

Marysville*

Mendota*

Merced*

Modesto

Oceanside*

Oroville*

Oxnard*

Perterville*

Salinas*

Sanger*

Santa Maria*

Turlock*

Ukiah*

Visalia*

Wasco*

Watsonville*

Woodland

REGION X

Idaho

Burley Office

Canyon County Office

Twin Falls

Emmett

Payette

Rexburg

Oregon

Hood River

Madras*

Milton-Freewater*

Ontario

The Dalles

Oregon (Cont'd)

Woodburn*

Washington

Bellingham*

Columbia Gorge*

Moses Lake*

Mount Vernon*

Okanogan*

Sunnyside*

Tri Cities*

Walla Walla*

Wenatchee*

Yakima*

***Bilingual Offices**

****Sub-Offices**

Table 5

STATES WITH HIGHEST ESTIMATED YEAR-ROUND ACTIVITIES

These are the five States with the highest estimated year-round MSFW activities:

California
Florida
North Carolina
Texas
Washington

The States listed above were selected in accordance with 20 CFR 653.107(i). These States must assign full-time, year-round staff to outreach activities. The remainder of the significant MSFW States shall make maximum efforts to hire outreach staff with MSFW experience of year-round positions and shall assign outreach staff to work full-time during the period of the highest activity.